

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 916

TM 007 624

AUTHOR DiCostanzo, James L.
TITLE Implications of an Alternative Social Reform Paradigm for Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 28 Mar 78
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (62nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Compensatory Education Programs; *Conflict; Educational Alternatives; *Educational Change; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods; Political Influences; *Program Evaluation; Social Change; Systems Approach; *Theories

ABSTRACT

A recent review of international literature revealed two basic social-change paradigms, equilibrium and conflict. These define ideological predispositions that influence the manner in which evaluations are conducted. Most current evaluations of educational reform can be classified under the equilibrium paradigm; the federally sponsored compensatory programs (Title I) are a prime example. When framed in the equilibrium or conflict paradigms, educational evaluations differ in purpose, method and scope. The purpose of evaluation, according to the equilibrium paradigm, is to provide decision makers with information necessary to improve program efficiency. The problem with this approach is that the goals of major reforms, including Title I, are ambiguous. With such diffuse goals, those in power can determine what is to be evaluated. The goal of conflict-oriented evaluation is to increase conflict in order to defend or advance underprivileged groups. A basic methodological distinction between the equilibrium and conflict paradigms is that the former is associated with systems analysis, a methodology criticized for encouraging diffuse goals; the latter advocates use of open or biological methods in which education is viewed as both affected by and affecting change in the social and political sectors. Conflict-oriented ideologies reflect the power structure which in turn influences evaluation. Because it sees education as but a subsystem of a larger social context, the conflict orientation is influencing the reconceptualization and redesign of educational evaluation. (Author/CP)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED161916

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Implications of an Alternative Social Reform
Paradigm for Educational Evaluation

James L. DiCostanzo

Learning Research and Development Center
University of Pittsburgh

March 28, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James L. DiCostanzo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Session 7.03

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Canada, March 1978. Drafts of this paper benefited greatly from the editorial assistance of Connie Faddis.

TM007 624

Implications of an Alternative Social Reform
Paradigm for Educational Evaluation

James L. DiCostanzo
Learning Research and Development Center
University of Pittsburgh

The function of ideology, then, precisely consists in the fact that it is applied by groups and individuals--by legislators in Congress, by judges on the bench, by jurors hearing a case, by teachers and students in the classroom, by journalists and newsmen covering the latest political crisis--and it does make a difference in the functioning of the social order. (Pratte, 1977, p. 43)

The purpose of this paper is to delineate differences between educational evaluation studies conducted from the "equilibrium" and "conflict" ideological perspectives. The implications of the conflict orientation on educational evaluation will be discussed. An attempt will be made to answer two related questions. First, how do educational evaluations differ when framed in the equilibrium or conflict ideologies? Second, are there implications to be found in the conflict orientation for reconceptualizing and/or redesigning educational evaluation studies? The discussion divides naturally into four main sections:

1. Introduction to the equilibrium and conflict ideologies;
2. Equilibrium and conflict views of the U.S. educational system;
3. Differences between conflict and equilibrium-oriented evaluation studies; and,
4. Implications of the conflict orientation for reconceptualization and redesign of educational evaluation.

The Equilibrium and Conflict Ideologies

Defining Ideology

The dictionary (Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, 1960, p. 721) defines ideology as "the doctrines, opinions, or way of thinking of an individual, class, etc." Although Pratte (1977) agrees that ideology can be thought of as consisting of beliefs or that it can be characterized "in terms of belief elements," he does not regard belief systems and ideologies as synonymous. It is only when belief systems are put into action, i. e., "transformed into significance and made a social force to be reckoned with" (Pratte, 1977, p. 37-38), that they become ideologies. It is in this context that the words "conflict" and "equilibrium" are used in this paper.

Ideology is not considered as an esoteric philosophy but as an ubiquitous influence in the formation of educational systems and in the design of educational evaluations and reforms. In explicating the ideology, and thus, the underlying theoretical biases influencing the structure and reform of educational systems, one illuminates the subjectivity involved, enabling the biases of the change agents to be considered overtly.

Theoretical Bases of the Equilibrium and Conflict Paradigms

Two basic social-change paradigms, equilibrium and conflict, have been identified and described by Paulston (1976). Each of these orientations encompasses three different theories whose explanations of social realities and generally accepted values lead to assumptions about the nature and functioning of the educational system in the United States. Those assumptions, in turn, predispose which questions, methods, and attributes

are investigated in educational evaluation. All six resultant theories are described below.¹

The equilibrium paradigm. The equilibrium paradigm's explanations of educational reform consist of the evolutionary and neo-evolutionary theory, the structural-functionalist theory, and the systems theory. The evolutionary theory attempts to extrapolate Darwin's theory of biological evolution to society as a whole. Paulston (1976) discusses Beeby's (1966) "unilinear evolutionary model," which describes the stages through which all educational systems must progress. The neo-evolutionists suggest that developing nations make use of the experiences of the technologically developed societies, e. g., by modeling their educational systems after that of the U. S.

The structural-functionalist (S/F) theory focuses on maintaining a stable society. Both evolutionary and S/F theorists share a strong conservative bias toward the undesirability of any but adaptive change. A system imbalance should require no more than small incremental adjustments (Paulston, 1976, p. 13).

Systems theory views education as an input-output system in which problems can be diagnosed and resolved, and greater efficiency of the system can be achieved by systematically assessing potential solutions. A number of techniques are covered by the umbrella term of "systems analysis," e. g., planning-programming-budgeting system (PPBS), performance-based and competency-based teacher education (PB/CBTE), and planning-research-development-diffusion approach (P-R-D-D) (see Cleland & King, 1975; Smith, 1975; Paulston, 1976). Educational change is somewhat restricted if viewed from the systems perspective.

The problem of educational change for those who see the world in structural-functional and systems terms is essentially one of rationalizing existing educational systems through the introduction of innovations that respond both to new social needs and to the need for greater efficiency in ongoing functions. (Paulston, 1976, p. 17)

Almost all current evaluation methods presently employed in the United States are couched within this theoretical view (e.g., Astin & Panos, 1971).

The conflict paradigm. The conflict paradigm offers another set of explanations of educational reform. It is comprised of the Marxist and neo-Marxist theories, the cultural revitalization theory, and the anarchist/utopian theory.

The Marxist theories sees successful educational reform occurring only when it follows changes in the economic and political systems. "In short, only when there is a demand for educational reform by the polity, will educational reform succeed" (Paulston, 1976, p. 27).

The cultural revitalization (and social movement) theory can be "viewed as attempts to innovate . . . new cultural systems specifying new social norms and behaviors" (Paulston, 1976, p. 30). The members of the cultural movement must "profess adherence to the movement . . . and emphasize the need to reduce stress through efforts for change" (p. 31).

The anarchist/utopian theory of social change incorporates the "radical" social changes advocated by the Marxists and the concerns for "individual renewal" of the cultural revitalists, but the ideas of this theory are usually "rejected" because they do not take into account the realities of existing power relationships (Paulston, 1976, p. 34). The suggestion to abolish the formal school system (Illich, 1971) and to redistribute

educational resources "in an inverse ratio to present privilege" (Reimer, 1970) are examples of proposed educational reforms based on the anarchist/utopian theory.

The brief summaries of the theoretical bases of the conflict and equilibrium paradigms have been presented for purposes of introduction. The next section discusses how the U. S. school system is viewed by proponents of the two paradigms. This background is necessary in order to contrast selected dimensions of the conflict and equilibrium evaluation approaches. The general paradigms (ideological perspectives) will then be discussed in more detail.

Equilibrium and Conflict Views of the U.S. Educational System

The previous section reviewed the main ideas of the theories that comprise the conflict and equilibrium paradigms. To explicate the differences between the paradigms more clearly, differences in their views of the societal role and the functioning of the United States educational system will now be presented. The discussion will also serve as background for examining the differences in the theories' approaches to conducting educational evaluation, and the implications of the conflict paradigm in traditional evaluation methods.

The logic behind the structure of the U. S. school system can be traced to the educational ideology of the Enlightenment. Evil was viewed as a product of ignorance. By eliminating ignorance through a formal compensatory educational system, man would be able to recognize and thus withdraw support from evil social systems. A "good society" would then presumably evolve.

The good society, for most sons of the Enlightenment, was the meritocratic ideal where men took up their positions in life not because of special privilege resulting from wealth, caste, status, or power but because of natural talent and virtue. The various inequalities that resulted from caste, class, and privilege had to be overcome in order to allow the true natural talents of men to emerge. (Karier, 1974, p. 281)

The evolution of a perfect meritocracy would mean that the societal position of each member would be determined by that person's natural ability. And what better way of developing each person's true talent than through formal schooling?

Some pertinent areas in which the equilibrium and conflict paradigms disagree are in the motives of establishing the formal educational system in the U.S., and in the degree to which the present educational system functions in producing a meritocratic society. From the equilibrium point of view, the motives for establishing the formal U.S. educational system were exemplary, and the system, as it exists today, approximates the ideal device for producing a meritocracy. Of course, since the paradigm assumes that the system is generally successful in approximating the ideal, only "incremental" changes should be necessary to improve its "efficiency" (Paulston, 1976).

The conflict paradigm does not view the U.S. educational system as the means of achieving a meritocracy. In fact, it is viewed as a means of maintaining the class structure (Paulston, 1976; Apple, 1974, 1975; Carnoy, 1975; Neelsen, 1975). The conflict paradigm questions the motives of those who established the compulsory educational system in the U.S. Karier (1974) states that the "Enlightenment dream," in its attempt to optimize individual talents, also "entailed shaping social attitudes so that the individual might more easily fit into the organic whole of society" (p. 282). The

attitudes of those in power are inculcated into the populace through the schools (Apple, 1975). This, in effect, reduces conflict and also controls the behavior of the masses (Carnoy, 1975). Katz (1971) claims that even the bureaucratic structure of the schools imparts certain "bourgeoise" attitudes.

One indicator used to investigate the validity of the meritocratic theory is the concept of "schooling efficacy--that schooling is a powerful force in shaping the subsequent life changes of any individual or, put differently, that schooling is a powerful and useful means for the attainment of social mobility" (Pratte, 1977, p. 144). Evidence in support of the meritocratic thesis is offered by Waller (1971), who demonstrated a positive correlation "between father-son difference in IQ score and father-son difference in social position" (p. 259). Waller's study, however, is limited in its generalizability because of his restricted sample (taken from the nonfarm white population of Minnesota).

Those who view the U.S. educational system in terms of the conflict paradigm challenge the existence of schooling efficacy. They argue that the school system actually maintains the present class structure by preventing social mobility (Neelson, 1975; Carnoy, 1975; Apple, 1974).

Bowles (1971) shows that a smaller proportion of high-ability, low-socioeconomic (SES) students reach grade 11 than high-ability students who come from high SES homes. Using these data, one is led to conclude that equal educational opportunity does not exist. Thus, "in our quest for meritocracy we have often confused our ideal with the real" (Karier, 1974, p. 280).

In contrast to the equilibrium paradigm, those framing educational change from the conflict orientation do not see it isolated (i. e., the system being self-regulatory) but following changes in the economic, political, and social order (Paulston, 1976).

The educational system alone cannot solve this problem; if the motivation to reach higher status levels for presently marginal groups is not built into new economic and social organizations, even equalizing exam scores of two groups will not provide equal opportunity. (Carnoy, 1976, p. 259)

The next section of this paper will examine in more detail the differences between the conflict and equilibrium approaches to educational evaluation.

Differences Between Conflict-Oriented and Equilibrium-Oriented Evaluation Studies

The theoretical bases of the two paradigms and the conduct of evaluations rooted in them may be used to illustrate differences in their approaches to educational evaluation on a selected set of dimensions. In choosing dimensions, a number of authors' conceptualizations are important, especially those of Paulston (1976) and Worthen and Sanders (1973). Hopefully, the dimensions selected encompass the most pertinent differences between the two approaches to evaluation.

Purpose and Role of an Evaluation

McLaughlin's (1975) comprehensive accounting of the evaluation efforts surrounding the federally-funded Title I reform illustrates the major roles of evaluation (accountability, program management, and quality control). It also reveals the main purpose of evaluation when viewed from the equilibrium

paradigm: to provide decision makers with information necessary to improve program efficiency. As a result, a large proportion of evaluation monies generated in the U.S. are allotted by Congress. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1968 is an example. Hill (1977) states that Congress is often the ultimate decision maker in such evaluations and he exhorts evaluators to accept the legitimacy of this arrangement.

According to the conflict orientation, the main problem with this approach is that the goals of major educational reforms, including Title I, are ambiguous. This ambiguity, which is a direct result of a lack of consensus (Harvey & Hill, 1977), contributes to the difficulty of defining the goals of the evaluation. These "diffuse goals . . . provide at best only vague notions as to which properties and attributes are relevant" (Dornbusch & Scott, 1975, p. 147). As a result, evaluation becomes the controlling tool of those with authorized power (Apple, 1975; Lortie, 1973). Those in power determine what to evaluate.

It is clear that government, at both national and state levels, is influencing the direction of American education more than any other sector in the society. This power derives primarily from the prestige of government and its control over monetary resources. (Smith, 1975, p. 6)

Apple (1975) concludes that the role of evaluations framed in the equilibrium paradigm is to preserve orderliness by reducing conflict. As such, this type of evaluation tends to legitimize the existing social structure.

In contrast to equilibrium-oriented studies in which the evaluator is satisfied with the status quo, evaluations framed in the conflict paradigm are aimed at increasing conflict in order to defend or advance underprivileged groups. The goal of the conflict-oriented evaluation is to

examine programs for "social justice and social equality" (Paulston, 1976, p. vii). In reference to Marxist and neo-Marxist theory:

Kallos (1975) suggests that these studies may perhaps be best characterized as critiques of traditional economic analyses of education, on the one hand, and as attempts to analyze the effects of investments in education and in educational planning from dialectical materialistic frames of reference on the other. (Paulston, 1976, p. 26)

To illustrate the differences described by Kallos, the purposes and roles of two evaluations, one equilibrium-oriented (Summers & Wolfe, 1975) and one conflict-oriented (Carnoy, 1976), will be examined.

Summers and Wolfe (1975) reported on an evaluation of the Philadelphia Public Schools that was conducted by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. The main question posed by these equilibrium-oriented economists dealt with improving efficiency or productivity: "In short, which school resources help learning, and how can these resources be allocated to maximize the learning of various kinds of students?" (Summers & Wolfe, 1975, p. 5). The study was designed to generate information for "the courts and legislature" so as to achieve "more efficient use of tax dollars" and to achieve "equity" (p. 3). The main purpose of the evaluation was to improve efficiency and it was to serve three main roles: accountability, program management, and quality control.

One way in which the goals of conflict-oriented studies can be achieved is by assessing the economic impact of a program or by assessing its social value. Three questions were raised by Carnoy (1976) in evaluating classroom educational television (ETV) in six countries:

- (1) What are the [economic] distributional effects of expanding schooling and upgrading the average level of schooling received?

- (2) What is the social value of increasing students' exam scores?
- (3) Since ETV is installed as a means of expanding schooling, what is the social value of increasing the number of graduates at various levels of school? (p. 221)

Two related but important characteristics of conflict-oriented studies are implicit in these questions. The first characteristic is the rejection of the assumption made in equilibrium-oriented studies that more and better of the same educational "stuff" is better. The second characteristic is the concern for social and economic equity. The former of these reflects the role that conflict-oriented studies play in increasing conflict and the latter expresses their purpose.

Methods and Procedures

Given the purposes and roles of evaluation as viewed from the equilibrium and conflict paradigms, the next question concerns what major procedural differences exist between them.

Numerous evaluation methods and procedures presently used are identified with the equilibrium paradigm. Among these are: PPBS (planning, programming, budgeting, systems), PBTE (performance-based teacher education), and CBTE (competency-based teacher education). These and other procedures rooted in the equilibrium paradigm (see Astin & Panos, 1971) are usually associated with systems analysis.

Systems analysis in the form of PPBS was introduced to the educational system on the federal level by President Lyndon B. Johnson. It was developed by the Rand Corporation, was used by the Department of Defense (DOD), and was reported as producing "dramatic" improvements in DOD's

efficiency and effectiveness (McLaughlin, 1975). "In education, PPBS has . . . come to imply procedures for educational planning, preparing budgets, evaluating performance, and allocating resources" (Smith, 1975, p. 3). Smith also notes that systems analysis (PPBS) has some of its roots in U.S. curriculum reform and behavioral psychology theory.

The "linear programming systems analysis procedure" has three main components for the planning of programs:

1. Define the objectives of the program operationally.
2. Determine the program's structure.
3. Perform program analysis (Cleland & King, 1975; Burnham, 1973).

These components do not define PPBS or systems analysis in general because it is comprised of many other aspects, such as budgeting and information systems (Yee, 1973; Burnham, 1973). They do, however, serve to: (a) illuminate the similarities among evaluation models operating from the equilibrium paradigms, and (b) demonstrate that systems analysis is rooted in psychological theory as shown by its use of behavioral objectives.

McLaughlin (1975) reports on the federal use of PPBS in a cost-benefit analysis to judge the effects of ESEA Title I. TEMPO, a division of the General Electric Company, was commissioned to perform the evaluation:

The study plan called for examination of exemplary Title I projects and identification of the features of successful compensatory programs. This evaluation strategy was expected to lead to more efficient purchase of Title I educational services and thereby more effective educational programs for disadvantaged children. (McLaughlin, 1975, p. 34) [Emphasis mine.]

The Title I projects included were compared on input variables (school, pupil, and background), process variables (distinguishing program features), and output variables (pupil achievement) (McLaughlin, 1975, p. 36). As mentioned previously, the purpose of this type of analysis in equilibrium-oriented evaluation studies is to improve the cost-benefit efficiency of the expenditure of the monies in education. This should occur with the identification of successful compensatory strategies or the identification of successful features of compensatory strategies. Unfortunately, none were found in the TEMPO study.

McLaughlin also identifies a major criticism of the systems analysis methodology, one that is often raised by conflict-oriented evaluators (see Cohen, 1973; Burnham, 1973). McLaughlin states that even though the legislation avoided defining effective "compensation," many people believed that it would result "in enhanced performance on standardized achievement tests" (McLaughlin, 1975, p. 38).

Dornbusch and Scott (1975) describe the problems surrounding "diffuse goals," which are found in Title I and in education legislation, generally. Their discussion of this concept offers an externally cogent criticism of the systems analysis procedure that is substantiated by the TEMPO evaluation of Title I and the evaluation of the federally-funded Follow Through Program (see Rivlin & Timpane, 1975).

Diffuse goals . . . provide at best only vague notions as to which properties and attributes are relevant, the values attained on the properties they do specify are not always readily observable, and the standards suggested are likely to be unclear or conflicting. (Dornbusch & Scott, 1975, p. 147)

As a result of diffuse goals, "over-zealous evaluators may focus on those components of the task which are most easily measured" eventually "transforming" the measures into program goals (Dornbusch & Scott, 1975, p. 147). In education, this "goal displacement" is experienced when the improved performance on standardized ability or achievement tests becomes the goal of the program because these measures are readily available.

There are two products of diffuse goals: creating a "rigid quantitative approach to evaluation" (Dornbusch & Scott, 1975, p. 148), and relying on social reference groups as standards. Of course, the latter of these has the effect of penalizing those from different cultures. Karier (1974) discusses the implications of standardized tests on meritocracy. He historically relates the "current efficiency craze" involving techniques such as systems analysis to the problems (e.g., objectification and manipulation) that were encountered in the "efficiency movement" that occurred in the evolution of the U.S. educational system (p. 300).

Probably the most potent criticisms framed in the conflict orientation of systems analysis are found in the writings of Apple (1973, 1975). He states that systems analysis is "reconstructed logic," i.e., systems analysis is what philosophers of science say scientific inquiry should look like. He believes that this is probably a less accurate view of scientific processes than post hoc analyses. This analysis technique also illustrates the need for certainty. Systems analysis has the effect of "maintaining technical control."

Another criticism that Apple (1975) raises is that systems analysis is believed to be "neutral" because it is "scientific." He points out, however,

that systems analysis procedures control by their very existence. Indeed, this is inherent in the functioning of the procedures (Cleland & King, 1975).

One of Apple's (1975) most urgent arguments is that systems analysis did not originate as a management technique. It was used initially to "illuminate" the complex nature of problems. Equilibrium-oriented evaluations have appropriated their models from the business community, thus "borrowing knowledge out of its self-correcting context" (p. 119). Apple claims that this business approach to education has a "dehumanizing" effect. Statements in the recent evaluation of the Philadelphia Public Schools conducted by economists (of the Federal Reserve Bank) bear this out:

Economists have something to say about efficiency and equity in education because they look at learning in a way which is analogous to a production process. Educational achievement, like shoes, canned tuna, and clean streets can be regarded as the output of a production process. (Summers & Wolfe, 1975, p. 6)

Both Paulston (1976) and Apple (1975), writing from the conflict orientation, advocate the use of "open" or "biological" system methods in evaluation. In this type of system, the educational system is viewed as a subsystem that affects and is affected by changes in social and political sectors. This, of course, can be contrasted with equilibrium-oriented studies seeking change within the educational subsystem.

Scope of Evaluation

Information may be relevant and important but lack sufficient scope to be useful. It may be the truth, so to speak, but not the whole truth; it may be a related perception but not the only perception. (Stufflebeam, Foley, Gephart, Cuba, Hammond, Merriman, & Provus, 1971)

This section attempts to answer the question, How do equilibrium-oriented and conflict-oriented evaluation studies differ in their view of the scope of the evaluation?

Based on the description of the equilibrium paradigm, one can conclude that an evaluation framed in this orientation is not going to challenge the foundation of the system. Rather, from this perspective (that of viewing a part from the whole), evaluations will be aimed at making "incremental" changes within the constraints of the educational system.

Conflict-oriented theories, however, perceive the evaluation process as viewing the "whole from the part" (Paulston, 1976, p. 36). That is, the educational system is only a part of the entire social context. Those viewing evaluation from the conflict orientation are dissatisfied with the educational system as it exists. They view it as unjust because it maintains the inequities of the present class order. They charge that any educational innovation that challenges the economic and political order will fail unless it is demanded by the polity (Paulston, 1976; Carnoy, 1975). Following this train of thought, it must be concluded that conflict-oriented evaluations assess not only the effect of the educational innovation on the educational system, but also the effect on the economic and political systems.

Perhaps the most succinct way of demonstrating differences in the scope of conflict- and equilibrium-oriented studies is to examine research questions that were actually posed. The TEMPO evaluation of Title I investigated three questions framed in the equilibrium paradigm:

- (1) What is the impact of Title I or compensatory education upon pupil achievement?

- (2) What school, pupil, and background variables are regularly associated with gains in academic achievement?
- (3) What are the distinguishing features of successful compensatory strategies? (McLaughlin, 1975, p. 36)

In the equilibrium-oriented evaluation study of the Philadelphia School System (Summers & Wolfe, 1975), "the findings . . . are addressed to the questions of how student achievement growth can be increased through school resource allocation" (p. 7). In the national evaluation of the Follow Through compensatory educational program, a somewhat broader evaluation question was asked: "Does Follow Through improve the life chances of participating children?" (Emrick, Sorensen, & Stearns, 1973). However, this question is never actually addressed. In fact, it underwent two restatements--first, it was operationalized as a set of research questions, and then it was operationalized as statistical hypotheses. The questions were transformed to fit the methodology. This "reductionist" process can be explained if one recalls from the previous sections that the equilibrium orientation emphasizes "efficiency," "closure," and "certainty" (Apple, 1975).

Implicit in the above research questions are several features that enable distinctions to be drawn between the scope of these evaluations and the scope of those conducted from the conflict viewpoint. First, as stated earlier, the equilibrium-oriented evaluation study is conducted within the educational system. An innovation is introduced to rationalize the existing system (McLaughlin, 1975). Second, changes resulting from the findings are usually incremental in nature (Paulston, 1976; Cohen & Garet, 1975). A conclusion might read: These features of the educational program made a difference in student achievement; therefore, increased support of them is

recommended. Third, traditional equilibrium-oriented evaluations are aimed at individuals within the system. (These last two points can be subsumed in the statement that this type of evaluation study views the part from the whole.) Finally, equilibrium-oriented studies appear to focus on outcomes that are achieved in a relatively brief temporal period.

Three research questions from Carnoy's (1976) conflict-oriented evaluation of ETV have already been mentioned (pages 10-11 of this paper). From an examination of Carnoy's research questions, one is led to conclude that the scopes of the equilibrium- and conflict-oriented evaluations are at the opposite ends of a continuum whose poles might be labeled broad and narrow. Conflict-oriented studies tend to: (a) take into account the societal context within which the evaluation occurs, (b) recommend large-scale national changes in societal institutions, (c) focus change on "masses" as opposed to individuals (view of the whole from the part), and (d) view and assess reform over a long period of time.

Level of Analysis and Constraints on Evaluation

This final set of contrasts between equilibrium-oriented and conflict-oriented evaluation studies overlaps with the others discussed earlier. However, additional insights can be gained by examining the level of analysis, i.e., the attributes and variables of educational programs and curricula examined in a study. These are strongly influenced by the ideological perspective of the evaluator.

The Title I TEMPO evaluation (McLaughlin, 1975), the national evaluation of Follow Through (Emrick, Sorensen, & Stearns, 1973; Abt Associates, Inc., 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977), and the evaluation of the Philadelphia

School District (Summers & Wolfe, 1975) were each concerned with finding the best method(s) of instruction and/or the most effective component(s) of instruction. All of these studies used standardized achievement tests as outcome measures. Karier (1974) discusses numerous inherent problems associated with such a use of standardized achievement tests.

Researchers framing evaluation in the conflict paradigm also point out that ideological parameters that influence curriculum construction and teaching are generally omitted in equilibrium-oriented evaluation studies. They see this omission as an important deficiency:

One of the most neglected areas of educational scholarship is the relationship between ideology and educational argumentation. We have but a very few studies of the way ideological presuppositions act as constitutive rules in guiding our day-to-day lives as educators. (Apple, 1975, p. 210)

Apple suggests three areas of schooling that need to be investigated. These are:

- (1) How the basic day-to-day regularities of schools contribute to these ideologies;
- (2) How the specific forms of curricular knowledge reflect these configurations;
- (3) How these ideologies are reflected in the fundamental perspectives educators themselves employ to order, guide, and give meaning to their own activity. (1975, pp. 210-211)

The first of these refers to the "hidden curriculum" in the schools, i.e., the transmission of norms and values (of the dominant group) through the everyday experiences in the school (Apple, 1974; Kallos & Lundgren, 1976) and in the structure of the institution itself (Katz, 1971). The second question refers to the actual curricular artifacts: "... where knowledge comes from, whose knowledge it is, what social group it supports, and so

on" (Apple, 1975, p. 211). The third point is related to the transmission of the values and norms of the instructor to the students.

Dahllof (1971) developed a conceptual schema for organizing the factors related to curricular reform. He labeled the selected grouping of factors in the research (e.g., environmental and curricular processes) "frame factors" (p. 75). Frame factors or "framing" is one method of approaching the questions raised by Apple. After reviewing the planning and development of Sweden's comprehensive school reform, Kallos and Lundgren (1975, 1976) suggested the use of framing and "classification"² as methods of dealing with the implicit and explicit decisions that constrain the view of research on teaching. The concepts of classification and framing are used to cope with power and control as these are reflected in curriculum and pedagogy (Kallos & Lundgren, 1976, p. 52).

Thus, framing and classification are procedures advocated by the conflict-oriented paradigm to increase the depth of the level of analysis over that which is usually defined in evaluations framed in the equilibrium-oriented paradigm. Besides examining outcomes, evaluators are urged to explicate those decisions that constrain and form pedagogy. "These decisions reflect the power structure at the political and economic level of the state," and manifest themselves as "observable aspects of the educational system" (Kallos & Lundgren, 1976, p. 53).

Implications of the Conflict Orientation for Reconceptualization and Redesign of Educational Evaluation

The conflict orientation appears to have implications for the reconceptualization and the redesign of educational evaluation studies. These

implications should be integrated, as much as possible, with the traditional equilibrium approach to evaluation. Paulston (1976) has shown that both the conflict and equilibrium paradigms are needed in order to explain "change and lack of change" (p. 39). Van den Berghe (1963) has logically demonstrated that congruencies do exist between the paradigms. By ignoring either paradigm, a part of an evaluator's potential explanatory power is lost. As Pratte (1977) stated, "Rigidly adhered to, an ideology can blind one to an alternative and perhaps more fruitful examination of phenomena" (p. 65).

In this light, the remainder of this section will discuss some of the implications of the conflict paradigm for the conduct of educational evaluation, and will identify some recent works in evaluation that indicate that an integration of the conflict-oriented paradigm has in fact already begun.

One of the basic differences between the equilibrium- and conflict-oriented studies is the view of the contextual setting. Application of the conflict viewpoint implies that the scope of evaluations of most educational reforms will be broadened. Instead of viewing the problem or innovation strictly within the educational system, its implications to the social, economic, and political systems will also be taken into account. This reconceptualization of the evaluator's world view (which I believe is more realistic) can be viewed as an extension of the systems view that many evaluators already utilize. Instead of perceiving education as a "closed" system, the evaluator will see it as a subsystem of the larger societal context. This open systems view has the potential to increase the validity of explanations of phenomena both by reducing the number of assumptions, and by promoting

general scientific advancement by increasing the commonalities and communications among disciplines.

Bronfenbrenner (1976), in his article "The experimental ecology of education," suggests conducting "transforming" experiments that would involve "innovative restructuring of prevailing ecological systems in ways that depart from existing institutional ideologies and structures by redefining goals, roles, and activities, and providing interconnections between systems previously isolated from each other" (p. 14). Thus, Bronfenbrenner recognizes the need for broadening the evaluator's view of the contextual setting, a significant and necessary step preceding any change.

Related to the broadening of the evaluator's contextual view are implications related to the traditional evaluation procedures: the setting of goals, formulation of the research questions to be investigated, methods of analysis, and outcomes.

The reconceptualizations related to the setting of program goals are: the necessity for evaluators to recognize the political nature of program goal setting (see Cohen, 1973); and the need for evaluators to identify the social, economic, and political forces that shape program goals. These reconceptualizations are, of course, intimately related to broadening the evaluator's contextual view. It is necessary to be able to describe a phenomenon before being able to act upon it. In the broadest sense, this reconceptualization will facilitate the evaluator's role in evaluating policy information while in the planning stage (see Wergin, 1976). In addition, the likelihood of identifying intended as well as unintended outcomes will be increased (see House, 1973).

Another implication derived directly from the above discussion is the change in the role of the evaluator. Instead of being passively acceptive of the goals of the program, the evaluator will become an advocate of a position (most likely congruent with his/her own ideology); this will result in greater independence of the evaluator, and will explicate conflicting arguments regarding the goals. Finally, the biases of the evaluator will be made public in the advocacy method. Wolf's (1975) recent proposal of a judicial evaluation approach demonstrates some of these features.

Alterations in the types of research questions to be asked and investigated are also implied in the conflict paradigm. Instead of questions being phrased only in educational terms, social and economic indications of program effect will be investigated. This reconceptualization of the research problem is a result of the broader view of the educational context and alterations in the program goals. Such a reconceptualization will serve to identify the costs and benefits to society. For instance, it will be able to link educational attainment to the society's economic distribution and to other indicators of quality of life (such as job satisfaction) that are now only assumed to be related. Studies of this genre, however, seem to be laden with practical problems (e.g., cost, time, etc.) and ethical problems (e.g., restructuring societal contexts in a true experiment). Another implication of the conflict paradigm involves the methods of educational evaluation. As was implied previously, evaluations framed in the conflict paradigm require substitution of an "open" systems approach for the traditional "closed" systems approach.

Apple (1976) lists three methodological principles with which ethnomethodologists have had success and for which he urges adoption in educational

evaluation. Essentially, these are: (a) withhold "official" diagnosis of problems; (b) examine the actual interactions of participants in the social setting to determine their common sense rules for curriculum construction; and, (c) link these to larger economic, political, and cultural settings (p. 212). It can be concluded that evaluations conducted using these guiding principles will be "illuminative" in nature, expounding both the explicit and implicit rules that govern curriculum construction.

Parlett and Hamilton (1976) recently developed an evaluation model rooted in anthropology that serves an illuminative function (also see Fox, 1976). Such a model is more descriptive in nature than traditional evaluation approaches. However, as Fox and Hernandez-Nieto (1977) point out, quantification need not be sacrificed.

In essence, the conflict-oriented anthropological models of educational evaluation are based on a conclusion about equilibrium-oriented evaluation that appears to be true in many instances. It is that the psychological-agricultural paradigm is inappropriate for educational evaluation, partly because of the current state-of-the-art of educational theory.

The conflict approach also has implications for the selection of variables. For example, when viewed from the conflict orientation, the identification of variables (and as we have seen, goals) that are based on the availability of measures of academic achievement and ability, is not consistent with the scope (multi-systems) or method ("illuminative") of educational evaluation. Selection of variables, therefore, must include the different types of constraints operating in the system. As mentioned previously, Dahllof (1971) and Kallos and Lundgren (1976) developed "frame analysis" for this purpose. Such a systematic way of examining the constraints

imposed from within and from outside the system is necessary if one accepts the premise that evaluators should examine educational programs in a broader context.

Summary

This paper has attempted to: present a brief description of the theories upon which the equilibrium and conflict paradigms are based; discuss the differing views of the U.S. educational system espoused by proponents of the paradigms; contrast their approach to educational evaluation; and discuss some implications of the conflict orientation for traditional methods of conducting educational evaluation.

Although many major points were discussed, and numerous others were mentioned, they have only scratched the surface of an area that is of great importance to anyone conducting educational evaluation. Hopefully, the discussion has provided evaluators trained in the agricultural-psychological tradition of experimentation (the equilibrium paradigm) with an alternative explanation of "truth," and with possible ways that this other conceptualization might be integrated into the methods they now use.

Footnotes

¹ These descriptions rely almost exclusively on the work of Paulston (1976). Additional clarification and sources can be found in his typological review.

² "'Classification' refers to the degree of boundary maintenance; to the degree of insulation between categories" (e.g., courses or subjects) (Kallos & Lundgren, 1976, p. 52).

References

- Abt Associates, Inc. Education as experimentation: A planned variation model. Volumes 1-4: Early effects of Follow Through. Cambridge, MA: Author, 1974-1977.
- Apple, M. W. The adequacy of systems management procedures in education and alternatives. In A. H. Yee (Ed.), Perspectives on management systems approaches in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational technology Publications, 1973.
- Apple, M. W. The process and ideology of valuing in educational settings. In M. W. Apple, M. J. Subkoviak, & H. S. Lufner, Jr. (Eds.), Educational evaluation: Analysis and responsibility. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.
- Apple, M. W. The adequacy of systems management procedures in education. In R. A. Smith (Ed.), Regaining educational leadership. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.
- Apple, M. W. Curriculum as ideological selection. [Review of Knowledge and Control: New directions for the sociology of education by M. F. D. Young (Ed.); Educability, schools and ideology by M. Flude and J. Ahier (Eds.)]. Comparative Education Review, 1976, 20(2), 209-215.
- Astin, A., & Panos, R. The evaluation of educational programs. In R. L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational measurement (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Beeby, C. E. The quality of education in developing countries. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Bowles, S. Unequal education and the reproduction of the social tension of labor. Cambridge, MA: The Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1971.
- Brofenbrenner, U. The experimental ecology of education. Educational Researcher, 1976, 6(1), 5-15.
- Burnham, R. A. Systems evaluation and goal disagreement. In E. R. House (Ed.), School evaluation: The politics and process. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.
- Carnoy, M. The political consequences of manpower formation. Comparative Education Review, 1975, 19(1), 115-128.

- Carnoy, M. The economic costs and returns to educational television. In G. V. Glass (Ed.), Evaluation studies review annual (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Cleland, D. L., & King, W. R. Systems analysis and project management. (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1975.
- Cohen, D. K. Politics and research. In E. R. House (Ed.), School evaluation: The politics and process. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.
- Cohen, D. D., & Garet, M. S. Reforming educational policy with applied research. Harvard Educational Review, 1975, 45(1), 17-43.
- Dahllof, U. S. Ability grouping, content validity, and curriculum process analysis. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.
- Dornbusch, S. M., & Scott, W. R. Evaluation and the exercise of authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.
- Emrick, J. A., Sorensen, P. H., & Stearns, M. S. Interim evaluation of the national Follow Through program 1969-1971: A technical report. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1973.
- Fox, G. T., Jr. Limitations of a standard perspective on program evaluation: The example of ten years of teacher corps evaluations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1976.
- Fox, G. T., & Hernandez-Nieto. Why not quantitative methodologies to illuminate dialectical or phenomenological perspectives? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.
- Harvey, J. J., & Hill, P. T. The NIE compensatory education study: Evaluation for decision-making purposes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.
- Hill, P. T. Research for congress as a client. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April 1977.
- House, E. R. (Ed.) School evaluation: The politics and process. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.
- Illich, I. Deschooling society. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Kallos, D. Curriculum and teaching: An Un-American view. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C., April 1975.

- Kallos, D., & Lundgren, U. P. Educational psychology: Its scope and limits. The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 1975, 45(2), 111-121.
- Kallos, D., & Lundgren, U. P. Lessons from a comprehensive school system for theory and research on curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1976.
- Karier, C. J. Ideology and evaluation: In quest of meritocracy. In M. W. Apple, M. J. Subkoviak, & H. S. Lufner, Jr. (Eds.), Educational evaluation: Analysis and responsibility. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.
- Katz, M. B. Bureaucracy and schools (expanded edition). New York: Praeger, 1971.
- Lortie, D. Rational decision making: Is it possible today? In E. R. House (Ed.), School evaluation: The politics and process. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1973.
- McLaughlin, M. W. Evaluation and reform. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1975.
- Neelsen, J. P. Education and social mobility. Comparative Education Review, 1975, 19(1), 127-143.
- Parlett, M., & Hamilton, D. Evaluation as illumination: A new approach to the study of innovative programs. In G. V. Glass (Ed.), Evaluation studies review annual (Vol. 1). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Paulston, R. G. Conflicting theories of social and educational change: A typological review. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh, University Center for International Studies, 1976.
- Pratte, R. Ideology and education. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1977.
- Reimer, E. School's dead: An indictment of the system and a strategy of revolution. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Books, 1970.
- Rivlin, A. M., & Timpane, P. M. (Eds.) Planned variation in education. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1975.
- Smith, R. A. Educational criticism and the PPBS movement in education. In R. A. Smith (Ed.), Regaining educational leadership. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1975.

- Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R. I., Merriman, H. O., & Provus, M. M. Educational evaluation and decision making. Bloomington, IN: Phil Delta Kappa, Incorporated, 1971.
- Summers, A. A., & Wolfe, B. L. Which school resources help learning? Efficiency and equity in Philadelphia public schools. Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Business Review, February, 1975.
- van den Berghe, P. L. Dialectic and functionalism: Toward a theoretical synthesis. American Sociological Review, 1963, 28, 695-705.
- Waller, J. H. Achievement and social mobility: Relationships among IQ scores, education, and occupation in two generations. Social Biology, 1971, 18(3), 252-259.
- Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language (College Edition). Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1960.
- Wergin, J. F. The evaluation of organizational policy making: A political model. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46(1), 75-115.
- Wolf, R. L. Trial by jury: A new evaluation method. Phi Delta Kappan, 1975, 57, 185-190.
- Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. Educational evaluation: Theory and practice. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1973.
- Yee, A. H. The limits of scientific-economic-technological approaches and the search for perspective in education: The case of performance contracting. In A. H. Yee (Ed.), Perspectives on management systems approaches in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.